·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/540,843	GILCHREST ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brian Whiteman	1635
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Non-Final Rejection</u>		
(1) <u>Brian Whiteman</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>David Clough</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 11 January 2006	Time: <u>N/A</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 102(e) rejection		
Claims discussed: 20, 26, 85, 89, 94, 100, 102,		
Prior art documents discussed: Beer-Romero (US 5858987)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief succession. 	on. The examiner will provide a writt arate record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
		,
$R_{\rm o}$		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	plicant/Applicant's Representative S	ignature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner explained the reasonsing behind the 102 rejection for claims 85 and 89. Examiner mentioned that upon further reivew of claims 20, 26, 94, 100, and 102 and claims dependent therefrom, the claims read on a gene or oligonucleotide comprising pTpT. Applicant's representative suggested amending the claims to recite the oligonucleotide consisting of pTpT. The examiner will amend claims 20, 26, 94, 100 and 102 to reflect applicant's suggestion.